



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

80

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,273	08/29/2000	Greg I. Chiou	17887-005320US	8802
20350	7590	03/25/2005	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			VU, VIET DUY	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2154		

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/650,273	CHIOU ET AL.	
	Examiner Viet Vu	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

Art Rejections:

1. The text of 35 USC 103(a) not cited here can be found in the previous office action.

2. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas, U.S. pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2001/0034743.

Per claim 1, Thomas discloses a computer-implemented method for modifying original web contents for use at a relocated web server, e.g., proxy server, comprising:

a) receiving a code segment from a primary remote source wherein the code segment includes a first relative reference that identifies object stored at the primary remote source (see page 10, par. 126, lines 1-4),

b) tokenizing the code segment into a plurality of tokens (page 10, par. 126, lines 4-5),

c) scanning/parsing the tokens to determine relationship between the tokens (page 10, par. 126),

d) modifying/translating the code segment based on the determined relationships between the tokens such that the modified code segment is compatible with the destination environment, including translating the first reference to a second reference that is directed to the destination server wherein usage of the second reference in a client browser causes

a request identifying information stored at the primary server to be sent to the destination (proxy) server rather than the primary server (see page 10, par. 127, 129).

Thomas does not explicitly teach that the destination environment includes a run-time library. An official notice is taken that conventional web-based application environment normally includes a run-time library for executing the web-based program properly.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize the step of modifying the code segment in Thomas such that the modified code segment is compatible with the run-time library stored at the destination server because it would have enabled the modified code to be properly executed at the destination (proxy) server (see page 10, par. 127).

Per claim 2, it is noted that Thomas' teaching is applicable to any conventional type of markup languages (see page 2, par. 16).

Per claims 3-6, it would have been further obvious to one skilled in the art to recognize that the code segment tokenizing and parsing steps would have been alternatively performed at the destination (proxy) node as opposed to at the primary (source) node.

Per claims 7-9, Thomas teaches that the source code could be modified for relocating and executing at any destination environment including client browser (see page 2, par. 15).

Per claims 10-14, Thomas also teaches that code modification includes resolving and translating linked objects, function calls, variables, statements, commands, identifiers, operators, etc., (see cols 5-9).

Claims 15-44 are similar in scope as that of claims 1-14 and hence are rejected for the same rationale set forth above for claims 1-14.

Response to Amendment:

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/28/05 with respect to claims 1-44 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new ground of rejection set forth above.

Conclusion:

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu whose telephone number is 571-272-3977. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached on 571-272-3964.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may

Art Unit: 2154

be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



VIET D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2154

3/15/05